

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29, and 32-39 were previously pending. As noted above, claims 34 and 38 have been amended, no additional claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Specification.¹ Thus, claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29, and 32-39 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112 Second Paragraph

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph for reciting optional language that does not limit the scope of the claim. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the “configured to” clause does not limit the scope of the claim. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview to Applicants’ representative. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that, as used in claim 12, the language “configured to” does limit the scope of the claimed subject matter. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph as recited subject matter for which it is unclear whether corresponding structure, material or acts are described in the specification in specific terms so as to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to identify the structure, material or acts from that description. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to the “means for establishing” element, support may be found throughout the specification, for example in the abstract and paragraphs [0024]-[0028], [0045] and [0048]. With respect to the “means for transmitting” element, support may be found throughout the specification, for example at paragraphs [0026]-[0029] and [0042]-[0046]. With respect to the “means for receiving” element, support may be found throughout the specification, for example at paragraphs [0028]-[0029] and [0048]. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 23 under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph.

¹ See, e.g., Specification, Paragraphs [0024]-[0029] and [0042]-[0048].

Claim Objections

Claim 34 is objected to for reciting material allegedly not found in the specification. Specifically, claim 34 recites, "a processor-readable memory" while specification paragraph [0068] discloses storage medium. In the interests of efficient prosecution, and with no intent to limit the scope of the claimed subject matter, Applicants have amended claim 34 to read as the Examiner suggests by replacing "a processor-readable memory" with "a tangible storage medium." Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection of claim 34.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29 and 32-39 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmad et al. (US Patent Application No. 2002/0082029) in view of Pepe et al. (US Patent No. 5,742,905) and further in view of Hall et al. (US Patent Application No. 2002/0080770). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some explicit reason to combine reference teachings.

As noted on page 4 of the Office Action dated March 4, 2009, the Examiner concedes that "Ahmad and Pepe do not explicitly teach transmitting a registration request, from the wireless communications device, over the packet data session to a voice message server to enable the wireless communications device to receive a notification, the registration request including connection information identifying the wireless communications device." Further, the Examiner asserts that Hall teaches this limitation. As support, the Examiner asserts that "Hall teaches the [home location register] HLR 114 keeps track of the location of the wireless device whether it is operating in packet or circuit switched mode as the wireless device travels, the [visited mobile services switching center] VMSC informs the HLR of the wireless device's current location (paragraph 0023)." Office Action dated March 4, 2009, page 4. The cited paragraph [0023] reads as follows:

"The HLR 114 in addition to knowing whether the mobile terminal 116 is operating in packet or circuit switched mode also maintains subscription data and keeps track of the location of the mobile terminal. The HLR 114 is able to keep

track of the current location of the mobile terminal 116, because as the mobile terminal travels into a geographic area served by a particular radio network 118 it registers with a visited mobile services switching center (VMSC) 120 which then informs the HLR of the mobile terminal's current location. There may be multiple VMSC's 120 located in the circuit switched network 102, where all of the VMSCs would communicate with the GMSC 112. The VMSC 120 that informs the HLR 114 of the current location of the mobile terminal 116 would also operate to service the mobile terminal."² (Emphasis added).

Contrary to the Examiners assertion, the above cited passage neither discloses nor suggests "transmitting a registration request, from the wireless communications device, over the packet data session to a voice message server to enable the wireless communications device to receive a notification from the voice message server of an incoming call from a circuit-switched network, the registration request including connection information identifying the wireless communications device" as claimed subject matter recites. (Emphasis added).

Initially, rather than disclosing "transmitting ... over the packet data session," the cited reference discloses registration with a VMSC where "[t]here may be multiple VMSC's 120 located in the circuit switched network 102." Accordingly, in so far as Hall discloses any registration, it does so with respect to a circuit switched network rather than "a packet data session" as is recited in the claimed subject matter.

Further, rather than disclosing "transmitting a registration request ... to a voice message server," the cited reference discloses that "the mobile terminal ... registers with a visited mobile services switching center." The registration disclosed in Hall merely refers to conventional access to conventional components of a network, rather than requesting registration to a specific voice message server as is recited in the claimed subject matter. For example, Hall discloses that "for purposes of clarity, a detailed discussion of conventional components (e.g. HLR 114, VMSC 120, GPMSC 120) ... has not been provided."³ Therefore, the HLR and VMSC discussed in Hall neither discloses nor suggests "transmitting a registration request ... to a voice message server" as is recited in the claimed subject matter.

Still further, rather than disclosing a "registration request including connection information," the cited reference discloses that the VMSC informs the HLR of the mobile terminal's "current location." The "current location" of a mobile device, as is discussed in Hall,

² See, Hall, Paragraph [0023].

³ See, Hall, Paragraph [0026].

does not disclose or suggest "connection information" for the mobile device as is recited in claimed subject matter.

As noted above, the addition of Ahmad and Pepe fail to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Hall. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Ahmad in view of Pepe and further in view of Hall.

Claims 4-7, 9-11 and 37 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 9-11 and 37 be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 23, 24, 29 and 34-36 include subject matter similar to the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12, 23, 24, 29 and 34 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in connection with claim 1.

Claims 15-18, 20-22 and 38 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12. Claims 25, 27, 28 and 39 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 24. Claims 32 and 33 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-18, 20-22, 25, 27-28, 32 and 33 be withdrawn.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29 and 32-39 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Ahmad in view of Pepe and further in view of Hall.

Application No. 10/643,604
Amendment dated June 3, 2009
Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2009

CONCLUSION

In light of these remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.


Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 3, 2009

By:



Kristine Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344
Direct: (858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502